



Bruedern, J., & Wooley, T. D. (2018). Arithmetic harmonic analysis for smooth quartic Weyl sums: three additive equations: three additive equations. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 20(10), 2333-2356. <https://doi.org/10.4171/JEMS/813>

Early version, also known as pre-print

Link to published version (if available):
[10.4171/JEMS/813](https://doi.org/10.4171/JEMS/813)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

ARITHMETIC HARMONIC ANALYSIS FOR SMOOTH QUARTIC WEYL SUMS: THREE ADDITIVE EQUATIONS

JÖRG BRÜDERN AND TREVOR D. WOOLEY

ABSTRACT. We establish the non-singular Hasse principle for systems of three diagonal quartic equations in 32 or more variables, subject to a certain rank condition. Our methods employ the arithmetic harmonic analysis of smooth quartic Weyl sums and also a new estimate for their tenth moment.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, investigations concerning the solubility of systems of diagonal Diophantine equations via the circle method have been enriched through the use of such unconventional elements as thin averages of Fourier coefficients only partially of arithmetic nature [5], and moment estimates of odd order [6]. These innovations have been applied in several instances to surmount the barrier imposed by the classical scaling principle for suitably entangled systems of diagonal equations. This principle suggests that the number of variables required to solve a system should grow in proportion to the number of its equations. In particular, the recent work of the authors [6] concerning pairs of diagonal quartic equations applies estimates for cubic moments of Fourier coefficients to show that 22 variables suffice to establish the Hasse principle. While the corresponding conclusion for a single quartic equation is available only when the number of variables is at least 12, our work [6] employs, on average, only 11 variables per equation. We now develop such ideas further, and provide a flexible approach to the control of large values of Fourier coefficients associated with quartic Weyl sums. Once the arithmetic problem at hand is transformed into one in which only Fourier coefficients are present, one is at liberty to consider fractional numbers of variables, as well as fractional numbers of equations. We illustrate the potential of such ideas by investigating the Hasse principle for systems involving three diagonal quartic forms.

Consider a matrix $(a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{3 \times s}$ with the associated system of equations

$$\sum_{j=1}^s a_{ij} x_j^4 = 0 \quad (1 \leq i \leq 3). \quad (1.1)$$

We verify the Hasse principle for systems of the shape (1.1), subject to a suitable rank condition on (a_{ij}) , whenever $s \geq 32$. This should be compared with

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11D72, 11P55, 11E76.

Key words and phrases. Quartic Diophantine equations, Hardy-Littlewood method.

The authors acknowledge support by Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

the conclusion from [3, Theorem 1], which would furnish the Hasse principle for systems of r diagonal quartic equations in s variables only when $s > 12r$. While the latter conclusion is consistent with the classical scaling principle mentioned above, our new result concerning the system (1.1) employs an average of only $10\frac{2}{3}$ variables per equation, and is even more economical than our earlier results [6] for pairs of equations. The new methods of this paper also improve the latter work, covering essentially all of those cases in 22 or more variables that had previously defied resolution (see [7]).

In order to give a precise statement of our result, we introduce some notation. When $s \geq 3$ and any collection of three columns of the matrix (a_{ij}) is linearly independent, we refer to (a_{ij}) as being *highly non-singular*. We say that the matrix of coefficients (a_{ij}) is *propitious* when $s \geq 32$ and it has the block structure $(A_0, A_1, \dots, A_7, B)$, in which $A_l \in \mathbb{Z}^{3 \times 4}$ is highly non-singular for each l , and $B \in \mathbb{Z}^{3 \times (s-32)}$. Note that the set of $3 \times s$ matrices with $s \geq 32$ which fail to be propitious is very thin. Indeed, typical $3 \times s$ matrices are highly non-singular, and hence also propitious when $s \geq 32$. Finally, given a positive number P , we denote by $\mathcal{N}(P)$ the number of integral solutions \mathbf{x} of (1.1) with $|x_j| \leq P$ ($1 \leq j \leq s$).

Theorem 1.1. *Let $s \geq 32$, and suppose that $(a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{3 \times s}$ is propitious. Then provided that the system (1.1) has non-singular real and p -adic solutions for each prime number p , one has $\mathcal{N}(P) \gg P^{s-12}$.*

We remark that [1, Theorem 1] guarantees the existence of a non-zero p -adic solution of the Diophantine system (1.1) provided only that $s \geq 25$ and $p \geq 2^{16}$. A familiar p -adic compactness argument (see [8, Theorem 4]) allows one to deduce that for a propitious system the p -adic solubility hypothesis in Theorem 1.1 is void for all $p \geq 2^{16}$, and one may determine whether or not it possesses non-trivial integral solutions with a finite computation.

The novel arithmetic harmonic analysis associated with our proof of Theorem 1.1 depends on the fourth power moment of certain Fourier coefficients. For a continuous function $H : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ of period 1, let

$$c(n) = \int_0^1 H(\alpha) e(-n\alpha) d\alpha,$$

where as usual we write $e(z)$ for $e^{2\pi iz}$. We relate the correlation

$$\int_{[0,1]^3} H(\alpha_1) H(\alpha_2) H(\alpha_3) H(-\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3) d\alpha$$

to the moment $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |c(n)|^4$, and bound the latter by using large values estimates for Fourier coefficients.

Choose a number $\delta \in [0, 1)$, and let

$$g_\delta(\alpha; P, R) = \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{A}(P, R) \\ \delta P < x \leq P}} e(\alpha x^4),$$

where $\mathcal{A}(P, R)$ denotes the set of numbers $n \in [1, P]$, all of whose prime divisors are at most R . When there is no doubt about the choice of parameters, we abbreviate $g_\delta(\alpha; P, R)$ to $g(\alpha)$. We take $R = P^\eta$ and $H(\alpha) = |g(\alpha)|^{8-\nu}$, where η and ν are sufficiently small positive numbers. An application of Hölder's inequality conveys us from the above correlation to the mean value

$$\int_{[0,1]^3} |g(\alpha_1)g(\alpha_2)|^8 |g(\alpha_3)g(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3)|^{8-2\nu} d\alpha.$$

Here the presence of even exponents offers the possibility of replacing the smooth Weyl sum $g(\alpha)$ by its classical cousin

$$f_\delta(\alpha; P) = \sum_{\delta P < x \leq P} e(\alpha x^4),$$

and one perceives the potential for applying the Hardy-Littlewood method to achieve an essentially optimal estimate. In this way, in §5 we obtain the estimate contained in the following theorem, which provides just adequate space for a subsequent application of the circle method to establish Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that a_i, b_i ($1 \leq i \leq 3$) are non-zero integers, and that $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Then, whenever η and ν are sufficiently small positive numbers and $1 \leq R \leq P^\eta$, one has*

$$\int_{[0,1]^3} |g(a_1\alpha_1)g(a_2\alpha_2)g(a_3\alpha_3)g(b_1\alpha_1 + b_2\alpha_2 + b_3\alpha_3)|^{8-\nu} d\alpha \ll P^{20-4\nu}.$$

Our proof of Theorem 1.2 involves an analysis of the large values of the Fourier coefficients

$$\int_0^1 |g(\alpha)|^{8-\nu} e(-n\alpha) d\alpha,$$

and this is made to depend on a tenth moment of $g(\alpha)$. Unfortunately, available estimates for this tenth moment would fall woefully short of the strength required to press the method home. We therefore reconfigure and enhance earlier analyses of quartic smooth Weyl sums due to Vaughan [14] and the present authors [4]. In this context, we refer to the number Δ_t as an *admissible exponent* for the positive even integer t if there exists a positive number η such that, whenever $1 \leq R \leq P^\eta$, one has

$$\int_0^1 |f_0(\alpha; P)^2 g_0(\alpha; P, R)^{t-2}| d\alpha \ll P^{t-4+\Delta_t}. \quad (1.2)$$

Note that, in such circumstances, it follows from orthogonality and a consideration of the underlying Diophantine equations that

$$\int_0^1 |g_0(\alpha; P, R)|^t d\alpha \ll P^{t-4+\Delta_t}. \quad (1.3)$$

Theorem 1.3. *The number $\Delta_{10} = 0.1991466$ is an admissible exponent.*

We remark that, by applying the methods of Vaughan [14], the authors [4] obtained the admissible exponent 0.213431 in place of 0.1991466, this improving on the earlier work of Vaughan [14, 15], which, when appropriately

combined, delivers the bound (1.3) in the case $t = 10$ with $\Delta_{10} = 0.2142036$. For the application considered here it is vital to have at hand admissible exponents Δ_8 and Δ_{10} with $\Delta_8 + 2\Delta_{10} < 1$. In our earlier work [4] we showed that $\Delta_8 = 0.594193$ is admissible. With the numerical value for Δ_{10} provided by Theorem 1.3, we obtain $\Delta_8 + 2\Delta_{10} < 0.9925$, leaving barely any space to spare in the precision to which we estimate the tenth moment¹.

Our basic parameter is P , a sufficiently large positive number. In this paper, implicit constants in Vinogradov's notation \ll and \gg may depend on s and ε , as well as ambient coefficients stemming from Diophantine systems such as (1.1). We make frequent use of vector notation in the form $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$. Here, the dimension r depends on the course of the argument. Occasionally, we abbreviate systems of inequalities $0 \leq a_i \leq q$ ($1 \leq i \leq r$) to $0 \leq \mathbf{a} \leq q$, and use (q, \mathbf{a}) as a shorthand for the largest factor common to the integers a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r and the natural number q . Whenever ε appears in a statement, either implicitly or explicitly, we assert that the statement holds for each $\varepsilon > 0$. Whenever R appears in a statement, it is asserted that there exists a number $\eta > 0$ such that this statement is true for all $1 \leq R \leq P^\eta$. Whenever ε occurs in a statement involving also R , then we allow η to depend on ε . Note that our conventions allow us, for example, to conclude that $R^9 \ll P^\varepsilon$.

2. THE TENTH MOMENT OF SMOOTH QUARTIC WEYL SUMS

In this section, we shall be occupied with the verification of Theorem 1.3. The new ingredient in our treatment is an approach to the exponential sum associated with the difference polynomial

$$\Psi(z, h, m) = m^{-4}((z + hm^4)^4 - (z - hm^4)^4) = 8hz(z^2 + h^2m^8)$$

that diverges from previous work in several respects. Some notation is required to describe the novel features in detail. Whenever $0 \leq \theta \leq 1/4$, we put

$$M = P^\theta, \quad H = PM^{-4}, \quad Q = PM^{-1},$$

and introduce the sum

$$E_0(\alpha) = \sum_{1 \leq h \leq H} \sum_{1 \leq l \leq 2P} \sum_{M < m_1 < m_2 \leq MR} e(8\alpha lh^3(m_1^8 - m_2^8)).$$

Our first auxiliary lemma supplies an estimate for the mean square of $E_0(\alpha)$.

Lemma 2.1. *One has*

$$\int_0^1 |E_0(\alpha)|^2 d\alpha \ll P^{1+\varepsilon} HM^2.$$

Proof. The integral on the left hand side of the proposed estimate is equal to the number of solutions of the Diophantine equation

$$l_1 h_1^3 (m_1^8 - m_2^8) = l_2 h_2^3 (m_3^8 - m_4^8),$$

¹Ford [9] and Israilov and Allakov [11] have recorded exponents Δ_8 and Δ_{10} that are smaller than those obtained here. These works are erroneous. See also [10].

in which, for $j = 1$ and 2 , the variables are subject to the conditions

$$1 \leq l_j \leq 2P, \quad 1 \leq h_j \leq H, \quad M < m_{2j-1} < m_{2j} \leq MR.$$

There are $O(PHM^2R^2)$ choices for l_2, h_2, m_3, m_4 , and for each such choice, the numbers l_1, h_1 and $m_1^8 - m_2^8$ are divisors of the non-zero integer $l_2 h_2^3 (m_3^8 - m_4^8)$. A familiar estimate for the number of divisors now shows that the number of choices for l_1, h_1, m_1 and m_2 is bounded by $O(P^\varepsilon)$, and the lemma follows. \square

The next lemma is the key to our new tenth moment estimate.

Lemma 2.2. *One has*

$$\int_0^1 |E_0(\alpha)^2 f_0(\alpha; 2Q)^4| d\alpha \ll Q^{5+\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. By Weyl's differencing technique [16, Lemma 2.3], one finds that

$$|f_0(\alpha; 2Q)|^4 \ll Q^3 + Q \sum_{0 < |n| \leq 32Q^4} c(n) e(\alpha n),$$

where the coefficients $c(n)$ are certain integers satisfying $c(n) \ll |n|^\varepsilon$. Write

$$\varrho(n) = \int_0^1 |E_0(\alpha)|^2 e(\alpha n) d\alpha.$$

Then it follows that

$$\int_0^1 |E_0(\alpha)^2 f_0(\alpha; 2Q)^4| d\alpha \ll Q^3 \varrho(0) + Q \sum_{0 < |n| \leq 32Q^4} c(n) \varrho(n).$$

By orthogonality, one has $\varrho(n) \geq 0$. Furthermore, Lemma 2.1 supplies the bound $\varrho(0) \ll P^{1+\varepsilon} H M^2$. Thus, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 |E_0(\alpha)^2 f_0(\alpha; 2Q)^4| d\alpha &\ll Q^3 P^{1+\varepsilon} H M^2 + Q P^\varepsilon \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \varrho(n) \\ &\ll P^\varepsilon (Q^3 P H M^2 + Q E_0(0)^2) \ll Q^{5+2\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 2.3. *The exponents $\Delta_8 = 0.594193$ and $\Delta_{12} = 0$ are admissible.*

Proof. The desired conclusion concerning Δ_8 follows from [4, Theorem 2] and the discussion surrounding the table of exponents on [4, page 393]. Meanwhile, the upper bound (1.2) when $t = 12$ is a consequence of [14, Lemma 5.2]. \square

We initiate our estimation of the tenth moment by choosing an admissible value for Δ_{10} . That such values exist follows from the trivial bounds for f_0 and g_0 . For the rest of this section, we work with the sums $g_0(\alpha; P, R)$ and $f_0(\alpha; P)$ only, and abbreviate these to $g(\alpha)$ and $f(\alpha)$, respectively. We put $g_b(\alpha) = g_0(\alpha; 2Q, R)$, and for the sake of concision, for positive even integers t , we write

$$U_t = \int_0^1 |g_b(\alpha)|^t d\alpha.$$

Further, we require the exponential sum

$$F_1(\alpha) = \sum_{1 \leq h \leq H} \sum_{M < m \leq MR} \sum_{1 \leq z \leq 2P} e(8\alpha h z(z^2 + h^2 m^8)).$$

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that Δ_8 and Δ_{10} are admissible exponents satisfying*

$$\frac{1}{2} < \Delta_8 < \frac{3}{5}, \quad \frac{1}{10} < \Delta_{10} < \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{3}{2}\Delta_8 - \frac{5}{7} < \Delta_{10} < 2\Delta_8 - \frac{27}{28}.$$

Put

$$\theta = \max \left\{ \frac{3}{17}, \frac{7 + 2\Delta_{10} - 3\Delta_8}{33 + 2\Delta_{10} - 3\Delta_8} \right\},$$

and define $\Delta'_{10} = \Delta_8(1 - \theta) + 4\theta - 1$. Then whenever $\Delta > \Delta'_{10}$, the exponent Δ is admissible.

Proof. Our starting point is an application of a suitable version of the *fundamental lemma*. Thus, as a consequence of [20, Lemma 2.3] in combination with the argument of the proof of [20, Lemma 3.1] (see [17, Lemma 2.1]),

$$\int_0^1 |f(\alpha)^2 g(\alpha)^8| d\alpha \ll P^\varepsilon M^7 (PMQ^{4+\Delta_8} + T) \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$T = \int_0^1 F_1(\alpha) |g_b(\alpha)|^8 d\alpha. \quad (2.2)$$

By Cauchy's inequality,

$$|F_1(\alpha)|^2 \leq HMR \sum_{1 \leq h \leq H} \sum_{M < m \leq MR} \left| \sum_{1 \leq z \leq 2P} e(\alpha \Psi(z, h, m)) \right|^2.$$

Here, we open the square and rewrite it as a double sum over z_1 and z_2 , say. The substitutions $z = z_1 + z_2$ and $l = z_1 - z_2$ then yield

$$\left| \sum_{1 \leq z \leq 2P} e(\alpha \Psi(z, h, m)) \right|^2 = \sum_{|l| \leq 2P} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{B}(l)} e(\alpha h l (6z^2 + 2l^2 + 8h^2 m^8)),$$

in which $\mathcal{B}(l)$ denotes the set of all integers z with $1 \leq z \pm l \leq 4P$ and $z \equiv l \pmod{2}$. Separation of the term $l = 0$ delivers the inequality

$$|F_1(\alpha)|^2 \ll P^{1+\varepsilon} H^2 M^2 + P^\varepsilon H M \sum_{\substack{1 \leq h \leq H \\ 1 \leq l \leq 2P}} \left| \sum_{M < m \leq MR} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{B}(l)} e(\alpha h l (6z^2 + 8h^2 m^8)) \right|.$$

Yet another application of Cauchy's inequality now produces the bound

$$|F_1(\alpha)|^2 \ll P^{1+\varepsilon} H^2 M^2 + P^\varepsilon H M (D(\alpha) E(\alpha))^{1/2},$$

in which

$$D(\alpha) = \sum_{1 \leq h \leq H} \sum_{1 \leq l \leq 2P} \left| \sum_{z \in \mathcal{B}(l)} e(6\alpha h l z^2) \right|^2$$

and

$$E(\alpha) = \sum_{1 \leq h \leq H} \sum_{1 \leq l \leq 2P} \left| \sum_{M < m \leq MR} e(8\alpha h^3 m^8) \right|^2.$$

On substituting the last inequality for $|F_1(\alpha)|^2$ into (2.2), we infer that

$$T \ll P^{1/2+\varepsilon} HMQ^{4+\Delta_8} + P^\varepsilon (HM)^{1/2} T_1, \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$T_1 = \int_0^1 (D(\alpha)E(\alpha))^{1/4} |g_b(\alpha)|^8 d\alpha. \quad (2.4)$$

We apply the Hardy-Littlewood method to estimate T_1 . For integers a, q with $0 \leq a \leq q \leq P$ and $(a, q) = 1$, let $\mathfrak{N}(q, a)$ denote the set of all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ with $|q\alpha - a| \leq PQ^{-4}$, and let \mathfrak{N} denote the union of these intervals. Note that this union is disjoint. Define the function $\Omega : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by

$$\Omega(\alpha) = (q + Q^4|q\alpha - a|)^{-1} \quad (\alpha \in \mathfrak{N}(q, a)),$$

and put $\Omega(\alpha) = 0$ when $\alpha \notin \mathfrak{N}$.

By Dirichlet's theorem on Diophantine approximation, whenever $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, there are integers a, q with $0 \leq a \leq q \leq Q^4 P^{-1}$, $(a, q) = 1$ and $|q\alpha - a| \leq PQ^{-4}$. Moreover, although our sum $D(\alpha)$ differs in detail from that used by Vaughan [14] in his equation (3.2), the proof of [14, Lemma 3.1] applies to our sum as well and yields the same estimate. We therefore conclude that the bound

$$D(\alpha) \ll P^{2+\varepsilon} H + P^{3+\varepsilon} H\Omega(\alpha)$$

holds for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Consequently, we deduce from (2.4) that

$$T_1 \ll P^{1/2+\varepsilon} H^{1/4} T_2 + P^{3/4+\varepsilon} H^{1/4} T_3, \quad (2.5)$$

where

$$T_2 = \int_0^1 E(\alpha)^{1/4} |g_b(\alpha)|^8 d\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad T_3 = \int_{\mathfrak{N}} (\Omega(\alpha)E(\alpha))^{1/4} |g_b(\alpha)|^8 d\alpha.$$

The estimation of T_2 will involve the application of Lemma 2.2. An inspection of the definitions of $E_0(\alpha)$ and $E(\alpha)$ reveals that

$$E(\alpha) \ll |E_0(\alpha)| + PHMR. \quad (2.6)$$

As a first bound for T_2 , we then have

$$T_2 \ll P^\varepsilon (PHM)^{1/4} U_8 + \int_0^1 |E_0(\alpha)|^{1/4} |g_b(\alpha)|^8 d\alpha.$$

Let

$$V = \int_0^1 |E_0(\alpha)|^2 |g_b(\alpha)|^4 d\alpha.$$

Then, a further application of Hölder's inequality yields the bound

$$T_2 \ll P^\varepsilon (PHM)^{1/4} U_8 + U_8^{5/8} U_{10}^{1/4} V^{1/8}.$$

We infer from Lemma 2.2 via orthogonality that

$$V \ll (PHM^2)^2 Q^{1+\varepsilon}, \quad (2.7)$$

and so by applying (1.3), we deduce that

$$P^{1/2} H^{1/4} T_2 \ll P^{3/4+\varepsilon} (HM)^{1/2} Q^4 \left(M^{-1/4} Q^{\Delta_8} + Q^{(5\Delta_8+2\Delta_{10}+1)/8} \right).$$

However, the hypothesis $\Delta_{10} > \frac{3}{2}\Delta_8 - \frac{5}{7}$ ensures that

$$\frac{3\Delta_8 - 2\Delta_{10} - 1}{3\Delta_8 - 2\Delta_{10} + 1} < \frac{7 + 2\Delta_{10} - 3\Delta_8}{33 + 2\Delta_{10} - 3\Delta_8}.$$

Hence we have

$$\theta > \frac{3\Delta_8 - 2\Delta_{10} - 1}{3\Delta_8 - 2\Delta_{10} + 1},$$

so that

$$M^2 \geq Q^{3\Delta_8 - 2\Delta_{10} - 1}.$$

We thus conclude that

$$P^{1/2}H^{1/4}T_2 \ll P^{3/4+\varepsilon}(HM)^{1/2}Q^{4+(5\Delta_8+2\Delta_{10}+1)/8}. \quad (2.8)$$

As our first step in estimating T_3 , we apply (2.6) to deduce that

$$T_3 \ll T_4 + (PHMR)^{1/4}T_5,$$

where

$$T_4 = \int_{\mathfrak{N}} (\Omega(\alpha)|E_0(\alpha)|)^{1/4} |g_b(\alpha)|^8 d\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad T_5 = \int_{\mathfrak{N}} \Omega(\alpha)^{1/4} |g_b(\alpha)|^8 d\alpha.$$

Write

$$W = \int_{\mathfrak{N}} \Omega(\alpha) |g_b(\alpha)|^4 d\alpha.$$

Then an application of [2, Lemma 2] confirms the estimate

$$W \ll Q^{\varepsilon-4}(PQ^2 + Q^4) \ll Q^{\varepsilon}.$$

Hölder's inequality therefore combines with (1.3), (2.7) and Lemma 2.3 to give

$$\begin{aligned} T_4 &\leq V^{1/8}W^{1/4}U_{10}^{1/2}U_{12}^{1/8} \\ &\ll P^{\varepsilon}((PHM^2)^2Q)^{1/8}(Q^{6+\Delta_{10}})^{1/2}(Q^8)^{1/8}, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$P^{3/4+\varepsilon}H^{1/4}T_4 \ll P^{1+\varepsilon}(HM)^{1/2}Q^{4+(4\Delta_{10}+1)/8}. \quad (2.9)$$

In like manner, another application of Hölder's inequality yields the bound

$$T_5 \ll W^{1/4}U_8^{1/4}U_{10}^{1/2} \ll P^{\varepsilon}(Q^{4+\Delta_8})^{1/4}(Q^{6+\Delta_{10}})^{1/2},$$

whence

$$P^{1+\varepsilon}H^{1/2}M^{1/4}T_5 \ll P^{1+\varepsilon}(HM)^{1/2}Q^4(M^{-1/4}Q^{(\Delta_8+2\Delta_{10})/4}). \quad (2.10)$$

By combining (2.9) and (2.10), we conclude that

$$P^{3/4}H^{1/4}T_3 \ll P^{1+\varepsilon}(HM)^{1/2}Q^4(Q^{(4\Delta_{10}+1)/8} + M^{-1/4}Q^{(\Delta_8+2\Delta_{10})/4}).$$

The hypotheses of the statement of the lemma imply that

$$\theta \geq \frac{3}{17} > \frac{1}{11} \geq \frac{2\Delta_8 - 1}{2\Delta_8 + 1},$$

so that $M \geq Q^{\Delta_8-1/2}$. Thus we conclude that

$$P^{3/4}H^{1/4}T_3 \ll P^{1+\varepsilon}(HM)^{1/2}Q^{4+(4\Delta_{10}+1)/8}. \quad (2.11)$$

We may now collect together our various estimates, first combining (2.5), (2.8) and (2.11), and substituting the result into (2.3) to obtain the bound

$$T \ll P^{1+\varepsilon} M H Q^{4+\Delta_8} (P^{-1/2} + P^{-1/4} Q^{(1+2\Delta_{10}-3\Delta_8)/8} + Q^{(1+4\Delta_{10}-8\Delta_8)/8}).$$

Since $\theta \geq \frac{3}{17} > \frac{1}{8}$, one has $HP^{-1/2} \leq 1$, and the bound

$$HP^{-1/4} Q^{(1+2\Delta_{10}-3\Delta_8)/8} \leq 1$$

follows in its turn from the hypothesis that

$$\theta \geq \frac{7 + 2\Delta_{10} - 3\Delta_8}{33 + 2\Delta_{10} - 3\Delta_8}.$$

Meanwhile, since we suppose that $\Delta_{10} < 2\Delta_8 - \frac{27}{28}$, one finds from the hypothesis $\theta \geq \frac{3}{17}$ that

$$HQ^{(1+4\Delta_{10}-8\Delta_8)/8} < HQ^{-5/14} \leq 1.$$

We therefore deduce that $T \ll P^{1+\varepsilon} M Q^{4+\Delta_8}$, and on substituting into (2.1), we obtain the bound

$$\int_0^1 |f(\alpha)^2 g(\alpha)^8| d\alpha \ll P^{1+\varepsilon} M^8 Q^{4+\Delta_8} = P^{6+\Delta'_{10}+\varepsilon},$$

where $\Delta'_{10} = \Delta_8(1 - \theta) + 4\theta - 1$. It follows that whenever $\Delta > \Delta'_{10}$, then Δ is admissible, and so the proof of the lemma is complete. \square

We are now equipped to describe the iteration that yields the admissible exponent recorded in Theorem 1.3. We recall from Lemma 2.3 that the exponent $\Delta_8 = 0.594193$ is admissible. Also, from the work of Vaughan [14] and the authors [4], there exists an admissible exponent Δ_{10} smaller than 0.22. Suppose then that an admissible exponent Δ_{10} has been established satisfying

$$0.2241\dots = 2\Delta_8 - \frac{27}{28} > \Delta_{10} > \frac{3}{2}\Delta_8 - \frac{5}{7} = 0.1770\dots$$

It follows that Lemma 2.4 then applies with

$$\theta = \frac{7 + 2\Delta_{10} - 3\Delta_8}{33 + 2\Delta_{10} - 3\Delta_8},$$

and that any exponent Δ'_{10} exceeding $\Delta_8(1 - \theta) + 4\theta - 1$ is also admissible. On iterating this treatment, one finds a decreasing sequence of admissible exponents converging to the larger root Δ_{10}^* of the equation

$$\Delta_{10}^* = \Delta_8 - 1 + (4 - \Delta_8) \frac{7 + 2\Delta_{10}^* - 3\Delta_8}{33 + 2\Delta_{10}^* - 3\Delta_8}.$$

On using the value for Δ_8 recorded in Lemma 2.3, one readily confirms that Δ_{10}^* satisfies the equation

$$2(\Delta_{10}^*)^2 + (27 - 3\Delta_8)\Delta_{10}^* + 5 - 17\Delta_8 = 0,$$

whence

$$\Delta_{10}^* = \frac{1}{4} \left(3\Delta_8 - 27 + \sqrt{689 - 26\Delta_8 + 9\Delta_8^2} \right) = 0.199146547\dots$$

Given any positive number δ , this iteration yields an admissible exponent Δ_{10}^\dagger , satisfying $\Delta_{10}^* < \Delta_{10}^\dagger < \Delta_{10}^* + \delta$, after a number of iterations bounded solely in

terms of δ . Consequently, keeping in mind our conventions concerning ε and R , it follows that

$$\int_0^1 |f(\alpha)^2 g(\alpha)^8| d\alpha \ll P^{6+\Delta_{10}^*+\varepsilon}.$$

We deduce that the exponent Δ_{10} is admissible whenever $\Delta_{10} > \Delta_{10}^*$, and thus we arrive at the conclusion of Theorem 1.3.

3. LARGE VALUES ESTIMATES

Our next task is to provide a proof of the mixed fractional moment estimate recorded in Theorem 1.2. Within this and the next two sections, we fix a choice of $\delta \in (0, 1)$ once and for all, and then adumbrate $f_\delta(\alpha; P)$ to $f(\alpha)$ and $g_\delta(\alpha; P, R)$ to $g(\alpha)$. Finally, according to Theorem 1.3 and Lemma 2.3, we are at liberty to suppose that Δ_8 and Δ_{10} are admissible exponents satisfying the inequalities

$$\Delta_8 \leq 0.594193 \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_{10} \leq 0.1991466.$$

When $0 \leq \tau \leq 1$, we define the Fourier coefficient

$$\psi_\tau(n) = \int_0^1 |g(\alpha)|^{8-\tau} e(-n\alpha) d\alpha. \quad (3.1)$$

Also, when $T > 0$, we write

$$M_\tau(T) = \sum_{\substack{|n| \leq P^5 \\ T < |\psi_\tau(n)| \leq 2T}} |\psi_\tau(n)|^4. \quad (3.2)$$

By applying the triangle inequality to (3.1) in combination with Hölder's inequality, one obtains the bound

$$\psi_\tau(n) \leq \psi_\tau(0) \leq \left(\int_0^1 |g(\alpha)|^8 d\alpha \right)^{1-\tau/8} \ll P^{4+\Delta_8},$$

and thus we may restrict attention to values of T with $T \leq P^5$.

We now seek to bound $M_\tau(T)$ when $1 \leq T \leq P^5$. Define \mathcal{Z}_T to be the set of integers n with $|n| \leq P^5$ such that $T < |\psi_\tau(n)| \leq 2T$, and write $Z_T = \text{card}(\mathcal{Z}_T)$. For each $n \in \mathcal{Z}_T$, we take $\omega_n = 1$ when $\psi_\tau(n) > 0$, and $\omega_n = -1$ when $\psi_\tau(n) < 0$, and then define

$$K_T(\alpha) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Z}_T} \omega_n e(-n\alpha).$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 |g(\alpha)|^{8-\tau} K_T(\alpha) d\alpha &= \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Z}_T} \omega_n \int_0^1 |g(\alpha)|^{8-\tau} e(-n\alpha) d\alpha \\ &= \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Z}_T} |\psi_\tau(n)| > TZ_T. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Before announcing our basic large values estimates, we recall that as an immediate consequence of [12, Lemma 2.1], one has

$$\int_0^1 |g(\alpha)^4 K_T(\alpha)^2| d\alpha \leq \int_0^1 |f(\alpha)^4 K_T(\alpha)^2| d\alpha \ll P^3 Z_T + P^{2+\varepsilon} Z_T^{3/2}. \quad (3.4)$$

Finally, we introduce the exponents

$$\kappa_1(\tau) = 11 - (2 - \Delta_{10})\tau \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$\kappa_2(\tau) = 19 + \Delta_8 + 2\Delta_{10} - (4 - 2\Delta_8 + 2\Delta_{10})\tau. \quad (3.6)$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let $0 < \tau \leq 1$ and $1 \leq T \leq P^5$. Then one has*

$$Z_T \ll P^\varepsilon (P^{\kappa_r(\tau)} T^{-2r} + P^{2\kappa_r(\tau)-2} T^{-4r}) \quad (r = 1, 2).$$

Proof. In the looming discussion we drop mention of T and τ from our various notations. When $r \in \{1, 2\}$ and $s \in \mathbb{N}$ is even, define

$$I_r = \int_0^1 |g(\alpha)^4 K(\alpha)^{2r}| d\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad J_s = \int_0^1 |g(\alpha)|^s d\alpha.$$

As an immediate consequence of (1.3), Lemma 2.3 and Theorem 1.3, one has

$$J_8 \ll P^{4+\Delta_8}, \quad J_{10} \ll P^{6+\Delta_{10}} \quad \text{and} \quad J_{12} \ll P^8. \quad (3.7)$$

Then an application of Hölder's inequality shows in the first instance that

$$\int_0^1 |g(\alpha)|^{8-\tau} K(\alpha) d\alpha \leq I_1^{1/2} J_{10}^{\tau/2} J_{12}^{(1-\tau)/2},$$

and by means of (3.3), (3.4) and (3.7), we infer the bound

$$\begin{aligned} TZ &< \int_0^1 |g(\alpha)|^{8-\tau} K(\alpha) d\alpha \ll P^\varepsilon (P^3 Z + P^2 Z^{3/2})^{1/2} (P^{6+\Delta_{10}})^{\tau/2} (P^8)^{(1-\tau)/2} \\ &\ll P^\varepsilon ((P^{\kappa_1(\tau)} Z)^{1/2} + (P^{2\kappa_1(\tau)-2} Z^3)^{1/4}). \end{aligned}$$

The claimed estimate with $r = 1$ follows on disentangling this bound.

Meanwhile, another application of Hölder's inequality yields

$$\int_0^1 |g(\alpha)|^{8-\tau} K(\alpha) d\alpha \leq I_2^{1/4} J_8^{(1+2\tau)/4} J_{10}^{(1-\tau)/2}.$$

Hence, by applying a trivial estimate for $K(\alpha)$ in combination with (3.3), (3.4) and (3.7), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} TZ &\ll P^\varepsilon (P^3 Z^3 + P^2 Z^{7/2})^{1/4} (P^{4+\Delta_8})^{(1+2\tau)/4} (P^{6+\Delta_{10}})^{(1-\tau)/2} \\ &\ll P^\varepsilon ((P^{\kappa_2(\tau)} Z^3)^{1/4} + (P^{2\kappa_2(\tau)-2} Z^7)^{1/8}). \end{aligned}$$

The claimed estimate with $r = 2$ follows on disentangling this bound. \square

We require large values estimates of similar type for related mean values associated with a restriction to a set of minor arcs. Define the major arcs \mathfrak{M} to be the union of the intervals

$$\mathfrak{M}(q, a) = \{\alpha \in [0, 1) : |q\alpha - a| \leq P^{-7/2}\}, \quad (3.8)$$

with $0 \leq a \leq q \leq P^{1/2}$ and $(a, q) = 1$, and then put $\mathfrak{m} = [0, 1) \setminus \mathfrak{M}$. When $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq [0, 1)$ is measurable, we define

$$\Psi_{\mathfrak{B}}(n) = \int_{\mathfrak{B}} |f(\alpha)^2 g(\alpha)^6| e(-n\alpha) d\alpha,$$

and when $T > 0$, define

$$M_0(T) = \sum_{\substack{|n| \leq P^5 \\ T < |\Psi_{\mathfrak{m}}(n)| \leq 2T}} |\Psi_{\mathfrak{m}}(n)|^4. \quad (3.9)$$

Define \mathcal{Z}_0 to be the set of integers n with $|n| \leq P^5$ for which $T < |\Psi_{\mathfrak{m}}(n)| \leq 2T$, and write $Z_0 = Z_0(T)$ for $\text{card}(\mathcal{Z}_0)$. For each $n \in \mathcal{Z}_0$, we take $\omega_n = 1$ when $\Psi_{\mathfrak{m}}(n) > 0$, and we put $\omega_n = -1$ when $\Psi_{\mathfrak{m}}(n) < 0$. Also, we define

$$K_0(\alpha) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Z}_0} \omega_n e(-n\alpha).$$

Then, as in (3.3), one obtains

$$\int_{\mathfrak{m}} |f(\alpha)^2 g(\alpha)^6| K_0(\alpha) d\alpha = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{Z}_0} |\Psi_{\mathfrak{m}}(n)| > TZ_0. \quad (3.10)$$

Before announcing our large values estimates for $\Psi_{\mathfrak{m}}(n)$, we recall the definitions (3.5) and (3.6) of $\kappa_1(\tau)$ and $\kappa_2(\tau)$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $1 \leq T \leq P^5$. Then one has*

$$Z_0 \ll P^\varepsilon (P^{\kappa_1(0) + \Delta_{10} - 1/4} T^{-2} + P^{2\kappa_1(0) + 2\Delta_{10} - 5/2} T^{-4})$$

and

$$Z_0 \ll P^\varepsilon (P^{\kappa_2(0)} T^{-4} + P^{2\kappa_2(0) - 2} T^{-8}).$$

Proof. Define

$$\mathcal{J} = \int_{\mathfrak{m}} |f(\alpha)^2 g(\alpha)^{10}| d\alpha.$$

An enhanced version of Weyl's inequality (see [13, Lemma 3]) shows that

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}} |f(\alpha)| \ll P^{7/8 + \varepsilon},$$

and so we deduce via (3.7) that

$$\mathcal{J} \leq \left(\sup_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}} |f(\alpha)| \right)^2 J_{10} \ll P^{8 + \Delta_{10} - 1/4 + \varepsilon}.$$

An application of Schwarz's inequality shows that

$$\int_{\mathfrak{m}} |f(\alpha)^2 g(\alpha)^6| K_0(\alpha) d\alpha \leq \left(\int_0^1 |f(\alpha) g(\alpha) K_0(\alpha)|^2 d\alpha \right)^{1/2} \mathcal{J}^{1/2}.$$

In view of (3.4) and (3.10), another application of Schwarz's inequality yields

$$TZ_0 < \int_{\mathfrak{m}} |f(\alpha)^2 g(\alpha)^6| K_0(\alpha) d\alpha \ll P^\varepsilon (P^3 Z_0 + P^2 Z_0^{3/2})^{1/2} (P^{8 + \Delta_{10} - 1/4})^{1/2}.$$

The first of the claimed estimates follows by disentangling this bound. For the second we proceed just as in the proof of Lemma 3.1 in the case $r = 2$, noting that the mean value estimates for J_8 and J_{10} should in this instance be replaced by the estimates

$$\int_0^1 |f(\alpha)^2 g(\alpha)^6| d\alpha \ll P^{4+\Delta_8} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^1 |f(\alpha)^2 g(\alpha)^8| d\alpha \ll P^{6+\Delta_{10}},$$

available via (1.2). This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

4. FOURIER COEFFICIENTS AND THEIR MOMENTS

Our goal in this section is the proof of an estimate for a certain mixed moment of Fourier coefficients associated with quartic Weyl sums. This we achieve by employing our large values estimates of the previous section so as to bound the quantities $M_\tau(T)$ and $M_0(T)$ defined in (3.2) and (3.9). We proceed in stages. In what follows, we make use of a positive number τ satisfying

$$40\tau \leq \min\{1 - 4\Delta_{10}, 1 - 2\Delta_{10} - \Delta_8\}. \quad (4.1)$$

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that τ is a positive number satisfying (4.1). Then*

$$\sum_{|n| \leq P^5} |\psi_\tau(n)|^4 \ll P^{20-\tau} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{|n| \leq P^5} |\Psi_m(n)|^4 \ll P^{20-9\tau}.$$

Proof. Observe first that

$$\sum_{\substack{|n| \leq P^5 \\ |\psi_\tau(n)| > 1}} |\psi_\tau(n)|^4 \leq \sum_{\substack{l=0 \\ 2^l \leq P^5}}^{\infty} M_\tau(2^l).$$

Thus, for some number T with $1 \leq T \leq P^5$, one has

$$\sum_{|n| \leq P^5} |\psi_\tau(n)|^4 \ll P^5 + (\log P) M_\tau(T) \ll P^5 + P^\varepsilon T^4 Z_T.$$

Should T satisfy the bound $T \leq P^{9/2}$, then it follows from the estimate supplied by Lemma 3.1 with $r = 1$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|n| \leq P^5} |\psi_\tau(n)|^4 &\ll P^5 + P^\varepsilon (P^{\kappa_1(\tau)} T^2 + P^{2\kappa_1(\tau)-2}) \\ &\ll P^{20-(2-\Delta_{10})\tau+\varepsilon} \ll P^{20-\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, when $P^{9/2} < T \leq P^5$, we discern from Lemma 3.1 with $r = 2$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|n| \leq P^5} |\psi_\tau(n)|^4 &\ll P^5 + P^\varepsilon (P^{\kappa_2(\tau)} + P^{2\kappa_2(\tau)-2} T^{-4}) \\ &\ll P^\varepsilon (P^{\kappa_2(\tau)} + P^{2\kappa_2(\tau)-20}). \end{aligned}$$

In view of our hypotheses concerning τ , one finds that

$$\kappa_2(\tau) \leq 19 + \Delta_8 + 2\Delta_{10} \leq 20 - 40\tau$$

and

$$2\kappa_2(\tau) - 20 \leq 18 + 2\Delta_8 + 4\Delta_{10} \leq 20 - 80\tau.$$

The first conclusion of the lemma is now immediate.

In like manner, one finds that for some number T with $1 \leq T \leq P^5$, one has

$$\sum_{|n| \leq P^5} |\Psi_{\mathfrak{m}}(n)|^4 \ll P^5 + (\log P)M_0(T) \ll P^5 + P^\varepsilon T^4 Z_0(T).$$

Should one have $T \leq P^{9/2}$, then it follows from the first estimate of Lemma 3.2 that one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|n| \leq P^5} |\Psi_{\mathfrak{m}}(n)|^4 &\ll P^5 + P^\varepsilon (P^{11+\Delta_{10}-1/4}T^2 + P^{20+2\Delta_{10}-1/2}) \\ &\ll P^\varepsilon (P^{20+\Delta_{10}-1/4} + P^{20+2\Delta_{10}-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, when $P^{9/2} < T \leq P^5$, the second estimate of Lemma 3.2 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|n| \leq P^5} |\Psi_{\mathfrak{m}}(n)|^4 &\ll P^5 + P^\varepsilon (P^{\kappa_2(0)} + P^{2\kappa_2(0)-2}T^{-4}) \\ &\ll P^\varepsilon (P^{19+\Delta_8+2\Delta_{10}} + P^{18+2\Delta_8+4\Delta_{10}}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in all cases, our hypotheses concerning τ ensure that

$$\sum_{|n| \leq P^5} |\Psi_{\mathfrak{m}}(n)|^4 \ll P^{20-10\tau+\varepsilon},$$

and the second conclusion of the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let a and b be non-zero integers, and suppose that the positive number τ satisfies (4.1). Then, one has*

$$\sum_{|n| \leq P^5} \psi_0(an)^2 \psi_\tau(bn)^2 \ll P^{20-2\tau}.$$

Proof. Observe that, by orthogonality and a consideration of the underlying Diophantine equations, one has $\psi_0(an) = 0$ whenever $|n| > P^{9/2}$. In addition,

$$\psi_0(n) = \int_0^1 |g(\alpha)|^8 e(-n\alpha) d\alpha \leq \int_0^1 |f(\alpha)|^2 |g(\alpha)|^6 |e(-n\alpha)| d\alpha = \Psi_{[0,1]}(n),$$

whence $\psi_0(n) \leq \Psi_{\mathfrak{m}}(n) + \Psi_{\mathfrak{M}}(n)$. Thus,

$$\psi_0(n)^2 \leq 2(\Psi_{\mathfrak{m}}(n)^2 + \Psi_{\mathfrak{M}}(n)^2),$$

and we deduce that

$$\sum_{|n| \leq P^5} \psi_0(an)^2 \psi_\tau(bn)^2 \ll \Xi(\mathfrak{M}) + \Xi(\mathfrak{m}), \quad (4.2)$$

where

$$\Xi(\mathfrak{B}) = \sum_{|n| \leq P^{9/2}} \Psi_{\mathfrak{B}}(an)^2 \psi_\tau(bn)^2.$$

On the one hand, by Cauchy's inequality and Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi(\mathfrak{m}) &\leq \left(\sum_{|n| \leq P^5} \Psi_{\mathfrak{m}}(n)^4 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{|n| \leq P^5} \psi_{\tau}(n)^4 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\ll (P^{20-9\tau})^{1/2} (P^{20-\tau})^{1/2} \ll P^{20-5\tau}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the adjuvant Lemma 9.2 provided in the appendix combines with the triangle inequality to give $\Psi_{\mathfrak{M}}(an) = O(P^4)$. Thus, as a consequence of Bessel's inequality, one has

$$\Xi(\mathfrak{M}) \ll (P^4)^2 \sum_{|n| \leq P^5} \psi_{\tau}(bn)^2 \ll P^8 \int_0^1 |g(\alpha)|^{16-2\tau} d\alpha.$$

By (1.3) and Lemma 2.3, we now infer that

$$\Xi(\mathfrak{M}) \ll P^{12-2\tau} \int_0^1 |g(\alpha)|^{12} d\alpha \ll P^{20-2\tau},$$

and thus it follows that $\Xi(\mathfrak{M}) + \Xi(\mathfrak{m}) \ll P^{20-2\tau}$. The conclusion of the lemma is now immediate from (4.2). \square

5. THE TRANSITION TO MOMENTS OF SMOOTH WEYL SUMS

In this section we establish Theorem 1.2. With this end in view, we put

$$\psi_{\tau}(m; l) = \begin{cases} \psi_{\tau}(m/l), & \text{when } l|m, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Suppose that a_i, b_i ($1 \leq i \leq 3$) are non-zero integers. When ν is a sufficiently small positive number, we write

$$I_{\nu}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \int_{[0,1]^3} |g(a_1\alpha_1)g(a_2\alpha_2)g(a_3\alpha_3)g(b_1\alpha_1 + b_2\alpha_2 + b_3\alpha_3)|^{8-\nu} d\alpha. \quad (5.1)$$

By Hölder's inequality, it follows via a change of variable and symmetry that there are non-zero integers c_i, d_i ($1 \leq i \leq 3$) such that

$$I_{\nu}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \ll \int_{[0,1]^3} |g(c_1\alpha_1)g(c_2\alpha_2)|^{8-2\nu} |g(c_3\alpha_3)g(d_1\alpha_1 + d_2\alpha_2 + d_3\alpha_3)|^8 d\alpha.$$

Since $|g(\theta)| = |g(-\theta)|$ and

$$|g(\theta)|^8 = \sum_{|n| \leq 4P^4} \psi_0(n)e(n\theta),$$

we find that

$$\begin{aligned}I_{\nu}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) &\ll \sum_{|n| \leq 4P^4} \psi_0(n) \int_{[0,1]^3} |g(c_1\alpha_1)g(c_2\alpha_2)|^{8-2\nu} |g(c_3\alpha_3)|^8 e(-n\mathbf{d} \cdot \alpha) d\alpha \\ &= \sum_{|n| \leq 4P^4} \psi_0(n) \psi_{2\nu}(nd_1; c_1) \psi_{2\nu}(nd_2; c_2) \psi_0(nd_3; c_3).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, on employing the inequality $|z_1 z_2| \leq 2(|z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_\nu(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) &\ll \sum_{|n| \leq 4P^4} (\psi_0(n)^2 + \psi_0(nd_3; c_3)^2) (\psi_{2\nu}(nd_1; c_1)^2 + \psi_{2\nu}(nd_2; c_2)^2) \\ &\ll \sum_{|n| \leq 4P^4} \psi_0(k_1 n; l_1)^2 \psi_{2\nu}(k_2 n; l_2)^2, \end{aligned}$$

for suitable non-zero integers k_i, l_i . Hence, we conclude from Lemma 4.2 that

$$I_\nu(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \ll \sum_{|n| \leq 4P^4} \psi_0(k_1 n)^2 \psi_{2\nu}(k_2 n)^2 \ll P^{20-4\nu}.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2

6. PRELUDE TO THE CIRCLE METHOD

We assume the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1, and in particular suppose that $s \geq 32$. With the column vectors $(a_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, we associate the ternary forms

$$\Lambda_j = \sum_{i=1}^3 a_{ij} \alpha_i \quad (1 \leq j \leq s),$$

and the linear forms $L_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ ($1 \leq i \leq 3$) defined for $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^s$ by

$$L_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \sum_{j=1}^s a_{ij} \gamma_j.$$

The hypotheses of Theorem 1.1 ensure that there is a non-singular real solution of the system (1.1). By invoking homogeneity, therefore, one finds that there exists a real solution $\mathbf{x} = \boldsymbol{\theta}$ in $[0, 1]^s$ for which the $3 \times s$ matrix $(4a_{l,j}\theta_j^3)$ has maximal rank. Hence, there exist distinct indices j_1, j_2 and j_3 for which the 3×3 matrix formed with the columns indexed by j_1, j_2 and j_3 is non-singular. The solution set of the system of equations (1.1) remains unchanged if one replaces any one of its equations by the equation obtained by adding to it any multiple of another equation. Thus, by appropriate elementary row operations on the matrix of coefficients $(a_{l,j})$, there is no loss of generality in supposing that the system (1.1) takes the form

$$a_{l,j_l} x_{j_l}^4 = - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \notin \{j_1, j_2, j_3\}}}^s a_{l,j} x_j^4 \quad (1 \leq l \leq 3), \quad (6.1)$$

with $a_{l,j_l} \neq 0$ ($1 \leq l \leq 3$). An application of the inverse function theorem consequently confirms that whenever $\Delta > 0$ is sufficiently small, the simultaneous equations

$$a_{l,j_l} x_{j_l}^4 = - \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \notin \{j_1, j_2, j_3\}}}^s a_{l,j} (\theta_j + \Delta)^4 \quad (1 \leq l \leq 3)$$

remain soluble for x_{l,j_l} with $x_{l,j_l} > 0$. In this way we see that the system (1.1) possesses a non-singular real solution $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ satisfying $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in (0, 1)^s$. Now we choose

a positive number δ with the property that $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in (\delta, 1)^s$, and fix this value of δ throughout the remaining sections of this paper. In addition, we fix $\eta > 0$ and $\nu > 0$ to be sufficiently small in the context of Theorem 1.2.

Next, define

$$G_0(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \prod_{j=1}^{32} g(\Lambda_j) \quad \text{and} \quad G(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \prod_{j=1}^s g(\Lambda_j).$$

Here and later, we write $g(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = g_\delta(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; P, R)$. By orthogonality, one has

$$\mathcal{N}(P) \geq \int_{[0,1]^3} G(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) d\boldsymbol{\alpha}.$$

The Hardy-Littlewood dissection is defined as follows. We put $L = \log \log P$, take $Q = L^{40}$, and when $b_l \in \mathbb{Z}$ ($1 \leq l \leq 3$) and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ we define

$$\mathfrak{N}(q, \mathbf{b}) = \{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in [0, 1]^3 : |\alpha_l - b_l/q| \leq QP^{-4} \ (1 \leq l \leq 3)\}.$$

We then take \mathfrak{N} to be the union of the boxes $\mathfrak{N}(q, \mathbf{b})$ with $0 \leq \mathbf{b} \leq q \leq Q$ and $(q, \mathbf{b}) = 1$. Finally, we put $\mathbf{n} = [0, 1]^3 \setminus \mathfrak{N}$.

The contribution of the major arcs \mathfrak{N} in this dissection satisfies

$$\int_{\mathfrak{N}} G(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) d\boldsymbol{\alpha} \gg P^{s-12}, \tag{6.2}$$

a fact we confirm in §8. Meanwhile, in §7 we show that

$$\int_{\mathbf{n}} G(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) d\boldsymbol{\alpha} = o(P^{s-12}). \tag{6.3}$$

The desired conclusion $\mathcal{N}(P) \gg P^{s-12}$ is immediate from (6.2) and (6.3) on noting that $[0, 1]^3$ is the disjoint union of \mathfrak{N} and \mathbf{n} .

7. THE MINOR ARC TREATMENT

In this section we establish the minor arcs bound (6.3). We start with an inspection of the proof of [21, Lemma 8.1]. This shows that there exist positive numbers B and C with the following property. Suppose that P is a large real number, and that γ is a real number with $P^{-B} < \gamma \leq 1$. Then, whenever $|g(\alpha)| \geq \gamma P$, there exist integers a and q with

$$(a, q) = 1, \quad 1 \leq q \leq C\gamma^{-12} \quad \text{and} \quad |q\alpha - a| \leq C\gamma^{-12}P^{-4}.$$

Note that, whenever $|G(\boldsymbol{\alpha})| \geq P^s L^{-1}$, then $|g(\Lambda_j)| \geq PL^{-1}$ for $1 \leq j \leq s$. Hence, there exist integers c_j and q_j with $1 \leq q_j \leq L^{13}$, $(c_j, q_j) = 1$ and $|q_j \Lambda_j - c_j| \leq L^{13}P^{-4}$ ($1 \leq j \leq s$). By considering the indices j_1, j_2, j_3 , one finds that there exist $b_l \in \mathbb{Z}$ ($1 \leq l \leq 3$) and $q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $0 \leq \mathbf{b} \leq q \leq L^{40}$, $(q, \mathbf{b}) = 1$ and $|\alpha_l - b_l/q| \leq L^{40}P^{-4}$ ($1 \leq l \leq 3$). Hence $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathfrak{N}$. This shows that

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbf{n}} |G(\boldsymbol{\alpha})| \ll P^s L^{-1}.$$

On applying a trivial estimate for excessive factors $g(\alpha)$, therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathfrak{n}} G(\alpha) \, d\alpha &\ll \left(\sup_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{n}} |G(\alpha)| \right)^\nu \int_{[0,1]^3} |G(\alpha)|^{1-\nu} \, d\alpha \\ &\ll (P^{s-32})^{1-\nu} (P^s L^{-1})^\nu \int_{[0,1]^3} |G_0(\alpha)|^{1-\nu} \, d\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Further, by applying Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\int_{[0,1]^3} |G_0(\alpha)|^{1-\nu} \, d\alpha \leq \prod_{l=0}^7 \left(\int_{[0,1]^3} |g(\Lambda_{4l+1}) \dots g(\Lambda_{4l+4})|^{8-8\nu} \, d\alpha \right)^{1/8}.$$

On noting that $g(\alpha)$ has period 1, a change of variables confirms that for each l with $0 \leq l \leq 7$ there are non-zero integers a_i, b_i ($1 \leq i \leq 3$) such that, in the notation introduced in (5.1), one has

$$\int_{[0,1]^3} |g(\Lambda_{4l+1}) \dots g(\Lambda_{4l+4})|^{8-8\nu} \, d\alpha \ll I_{8\nu}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}).$$

Hence, by Theorem 1.2, one concludes that

$$\int_{\mathfrak{n}} G(\alpha) \, d\alpha \ll (P^{s-32})^{1-\nu} (P^s L^{-1})^\nu (P^{20-32\nu}) \ll P^{s-12} L^{-\nu}.$$

This inequality is a quantitative form of (6.3)

8. THE MAJOR ARCS ANALYSIS

The analysis of the major arcs is largely standard. Define

$$\begin{aligned} S(q, a) &= \sum_{r=1}^q e(ar^4/q), \quad T(q, \mathbf{c}) = q^{-s} \prod_{j=1}^s S(q, \Lambda_j(\mathbf{c})), \\ \mathfrak{A}(q) &= \sum_{\substack{1 \leq \mathbf{c} \leq q \\ (q, \mathbf{c})=1}} T(q, \mathbf{c}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{S}(X) = \sum_{1 \leq q \leq X} \mathfrak{A}(q). \end{aligned}$$

Also, put

$$v(\theta) = \int_{\delta P}^P e(\theta \gamma^4) \, d\gamma \quad \text{and} \quad V(\gamma) = \prod_{j=1}^s v(\Lambda_j(\gamma)).$$

Write $\mathcal{B}(X) = [-XP^{-4}, XP^{-4}]^3$ and define

$$\mathfrak{J}(X) = \int_{\mathcal{B}(X)} V(\gamma) \, d\gamma.$$

Standard arguments ([14, Lemma 5.4] and [19, Lemma 8.5]) show that there is a positive number ϱ having the property that whenever $\alpha \in \mathfrak{N}(q, \mathbf{b}) \subseteq \mathfrak{N}$, one has

$$G(\alpha) - \varrho T(q, \mathbf{c}) V(\alpha - \mathbf{b}/q) \ll P^s (\log P)^{-1/2}.$$

Integrating over \mathfrak{N} , we infer that

$$\int_{\mathfrak{N}} G(\alpha) \, d\alpha = \varrho \mathfrak{S}(Q) \mathfrak{J}(Q) + O(P^{s-12} (\log P)^{-1/4}). \quad (8.1)$$

Lemma 8.1. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1, the limit $\mathfrak{S} = \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{S}(X)$ exists, one has $\mathfrak{S} - \mathfrak{S}(X) \ll X^{-1/2}$, and $\mathfrak{S} \gg 1$.*

Proof. Recall that [16, Theorem 4.2] gives $q^{-1}S(q, a) \ll q^{-1/4}(q, a)^{1/4}$. Hence, on writing $u_j = (q, \Lambda_j(\mathbf{c}))$, we obtain

$$T(q, \mathbf{c}) \ll q^{-8}(u_1 u_2 \dots u_{32})^{1/4}.$$

By applying the elementary inequality $|z_1 \dots z_n| \leq |z_1|^n + \dots + |z_n|^n$ twice, one finds that

$$(u_1 u_2 \dots u_{32})^{1/4} \ll \sum_{l=0}^7 \sum_{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \in \mathcal{S}_l} |u_{\mathbf{a}} u_{\mathbf{b}} u_{\mathbf{c}}|^{8/3},$$

where \mathcal{S}_l denotes the set of triples of integers $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$ with

$$4l < \mathbf{a} < \mathbf{b} < \mathbf{c} \leq 4l + 4.$$

Thus

$$\mathfrak{A}(q) \ll q^{-8} \max_{0 \leq l \leq 7} \max_{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \in \mathcal{S}_l} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq \mathbf{c} \leq q \\ (q, \mathbf{c})=1}} |u_{\mathbf{a}} u_{\mathbf{b}} u_{\mathbf{c}}|^{8/3}.$$

By symmetry, we may suppose that the maximum here occurs when $l = 0$ and $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) = (1, 2, 3)$. The argument following from equation (95) to the end of the proof of Lemma 23 in Davenport and Lewis [8] then shows that

$$\mathfrak{A}(q) \ll q^{-8} \sum_{\substack{u_1 | q \\ (u_1, u_2, u_3) \ll 1}} \sum_{u_2 | q} \sum_{u_3 | q} (u_1 u_2 u_3)^{8/3} q^3 / (u_1 u_2 u_3).$$

Since $u_1 u_2 u_3 \ll q^2$, an elementary estimate for the divisor function yields the bound $\mathfrak{A}(q) \ll q^{\varepsilon-5/3}$. Hence $\lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{S}(X)$ exists, and $\mathfrak{S} - \mathfrak{S}(X) \ll X^{\varepsilon-2/3}$. The remaining conclusions follow as in [8, Lemma 31]. \square

Lemma 8.2. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1, the limit $\mathfrak{J} = \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{J}(X)$ exists, one has $\mathfrak{J} - \mathfrak{J}(X) \ll P^{s-12} X^{-1}$, and $\mathfrak{J} \gg P^{s-12}$.*

Proof. Write $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}(X)$ for $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathcal{B}(X)$, and recall the prearrangement of indices implicit in (6.1). Then a direct modification of the argument of [8, Lemma 30], following an analysis similar to that of Lemma 8.1, confirms that, for a suitable positive number $\Theta = \Theta(\mathbf{c})$, one has

$$\int_{\widehat{\mathcal{B}}(X)} |v(\Lambda_1(\gamma)) \dots v(\Lambda_{32}(\gamma))| d\gamma \ll P^{32} \int_{\widehat{\mathcal{B}}(\Theta X)} \prod_{i=1}^3 (1 + P^4 |\xi_i|)^{-8/3} d\boldsymbol{\xi}.$$

By applying trivial bounds for the additional factors $v(\Lambda_j(\gamma))$ for $j > 32$, we therefore conclude that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathcal{B}(X)} V(\boldsymbol{\xi}) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \ll P^{s-32} (P^{20} X^{-1}) \ll P^{s-12} X^{-1}.$$

In particular, the limit $\mathfrak{J} = \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{J}(X)$ exists, and one has $\mathfrak{J} - \mathfrak{J}(X) \ll P^{s-12} X^{-1}$. By the argument concluding the proof of [8, Lemma 30], one finds via Fourier's integral theorem that $\mathfrak{J} \gg P^{s-12}$. \square

Subject to the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1, the conclusions of Lemmata 8.1 and 8.2 combine with (8.1) to deliver the lower bound (6.2). In view of the discussion concluding §6, this establishes Theorem 1.1.

9. APPENDIX: AN ADJUVANT LEMMA

Before announcing our adjuvant pruning lemma, for $k \geq 4$ we define the multiplicative function $w_k(q)$ by defining, for each prime number p ,

$$w_k(p^{uk+v}) = \begin{cases} kp^{-u-1/2}, & \text{when } u \geq 0 \text{ and } v = 1, \\ p^{-u-1}, & \text{when } u \geq 0 \text{ and } 2 \leq v \leq k. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 9.1. *Suppose that $k \geq 4$. Let \mathfrak{K} denote the union of the intervals*

$$\mathfrak{K}(q, a) = \{\alpha \in [0, 1) : |q\alpha - a| \leq P^{1-k}\},$$

with $0 \leq a \leq q \leq P$ and $(a, q) = 1$. Let ω be a real number with $\omega > 1$, and define the function $\Upsilon_\omega(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in \mathfrak{K}$ by taking

$$\Upsilon_\omega(\alpha) = w_k(q)^{2\omega} (1 + P^k |\alpha - a/q|)^{-\omega},$$

when $\alpha \in \mathfrak{K}(q, a) \subseteq \mathfrak{K}$. Also, let t be a real number with $t \geq \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$. Then for any subset \mathcal{A} of $[1, P] \cap \mathbb{Z}$, one has

$$\int_{\mathfrak{K}} \Upsilon_\omega(\alpha) \left| \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}} e(\alpha x^k) \right|^{2t} d\alpha \ll P^{2t-k}.$$

Proof. We follow the proof of [18, Lemma 5.4] as far as [18, equation (5.8)], mutatis mutandis, reaching the estimate

$$\int_{\mathfrak{K}} \Upsilon_\omega(\alpha) \left| \sum_{x \in \mathcal{A}} e(\alpha x^k) \right|^{2t} d\alpha \ll P^{2t-k} \sum_{1 \leq q \leq P} w_k(q)^{2\omega} \sigma(q), \quad (9.1)$$

where

$$\sigma(q) = \sum_{r|q} r w_k(r)^{2t},$$

given in [18, equation (5.9)]. Following the argument concluding the proof of [18, Lemma 5.4], we find that

$$\begin{aligned} w_k(p)^{2\omega} \sigma(p) &\ll_k p^{-\omega}, \\ w_k(p^{uk+1})^{2\omega} \sigma(p^{uk+1}) &\ll_k p^{-u-\omega+1/k} \quad (u \geq 1), \\ w_k(p^{uk+v})^{2\omega} \sigma(p^{uk+v}) &\ll_k p^{-u-\omega} \quad (u \geq 0 \text{ and } 2 \leq v \leq k), \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\sum_{1 \leq q \leq P} w_k(q)^{2\omega} \sigma(q) \leq \prod_{p \leq P} (1 + Ap^{-\omega}),$$

for a suitable $A = A(k, \omega) > 0$. Since $\omega > 1$, the desired conclusion now follows from (9.1). \square

We apply this lemma when $k = 4$ to confirm the following estimate that we announce in the notation of §4. In particular, we recall the definition of the major arcs \mathfrak{M} given via (3.8).

Lemma 9.2. *One has*

$$\int_{\mathfrak{M}} |f(\alpha)^2 g(\alpha)^6| d\alpha \ll P^4.$$

Proof. By reference to [16, Theorem 4.1] and its sequel in [16], one finds that when $\alpha \in \mathfrak{M}(q, a) \subseteq \mathfrak{M}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} f(\alpha) &\ll Pw_4(q)(1 + P^4|\alpha - a/q|)^{-1} + O(P^{1/4+\varepsilon}) \\ &\ll Pw_4(q)(1 + P^4|\alpha - a/q|)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, as an immediate consequence of Lemma 9.1, one obtains

$$\int_{\mathfrak{M}} |f(\alpha)^{8/3} g(\alpha)^4| d\alpha \ll P^{8/3} \int_{\mathfrak{M}} \Upsilon_{4/3}(\alpha) |g(\alpha)|^4 d\alpha \ll P^{8/3}.$$

We recall that Lemma 2.3 shows $\Delta_{12} = 0$ to be an admissible exponent. Then it follows via Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathfrak{M}} |f(\alpha)^2 g(\alpha)^6| d\alpha &\leq \left(\int_{\mathfrak{M}} |f(\alpha)^{8/3} g(\alpha)^4| d\alpha \right)^{3/4} \left(\int_0^1 |g(\alpha)|^{12} d\alpha \right)^{1/4} \\ &\ll (P^{8/3})^{3/4} (P^8)^{1/4} \ll P^4. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] O. D. Atkinson, J. Brüdern and R. J. Cook, *Simultaneous additive congruences to a large prime modulus*. Mathematika 39 (1992), no. 1, 1–9.
- [2] J. Brüdern, *A problem in additive number theory*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **103** (1988), no. 1, 27–33.
- [3] J. Brüdern and R. J. Cook, *On simultaneous diagonal equations and inequalities*, Acta Arith. **62** (1992), no. 2, 125–149.
- [4] J. Brüdern and T. D. Wooley, *On Waring's problem: two cubes and seven biquadrates*, Tsukuba J. Math. **24** (2000), no. 2, 387–417.
- [5] J. Brüdern and T. D. Wooley, *The Hasse principle for pairs of diagonal cubic forms*, Ann. of Math. (2) **166** (2007), no. 3, 865–895.
- [6] J. Brüdern and T. D. Wooley, *Cubic moments of Fourier coefficients and pairs of diagonal quartic forms*. J. Europ. Math. Soc., to appear.
- [7] J. Brüdern and T. D. Wooley, *Pairs of diagonal quartic forms: the non-singular Hasse principle*, in preparation.
- [8] H. Davenport and D. J. Lewis, *Simultaneous equations of additive type*, Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **264** (1969), 557–595.
- [9] K. B. Ford, *The representation of numbers as sums of unlike powers. II*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 9 (1996), no. 4, 919–940.
- [10] K. B. Ford, *Addendum and corrigendum to “The representation of numbers as sums of unlike powers. II”*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 12 (1999), no. 4, 1213.

- [11] M. I. Israilov and I. A. Allakov, *On the sum of k th powers of natural numbers*, Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov 207 (1994), 172–179. (Russian).
- [12] K. Kawada and T. D. Wooley, *Davenport’s method and slim exceptional sets: the asymptotic formulae in Waring’s problem*, Mathematika **56** (2010), no. 2, 305–321.
- [13] R. C. Vaughan, *On Waring’s problem for smaller exponents. II*, Mathematika **33** (1986), no. 1, 6–22.
- [14] R. C. Vaughan, *A new iterative method in Waring’s problem*, Acta Math. **162** (1989), no. 1-2, 1–71.
- [15] R. C. Vaughan, *A new iterative method in Waring’s problem II*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **39** (1989), no. 2, 219–230.
- [16] R. C. Vaughan, *The Hardy-Littlewood method*, 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [17] R. C. Vaughan and T. D. Wooley, *Further improvements in Waring’s problem*, Acta Math. **174** (1995), no. 2, 147–240.
- [18] R. C. Vaughan and T. D. Wooley, *Further improvements in Waring’s problem, IV: Higher powers*, Acta Arith. **94** (2000), no. 3, 203–285.
- [19] T. D. Wooley, *On simultaneous additive equations, II*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **419** (1991), 141–198.
- [20] T. D. Wooley, *Large improvements in Waring’s problem*, Ann. of Math. (2) **135** (1992), no. 1, 131–164.
- [21] T. D. Wooley, *On Diophantine inequalities: Freeman’s asymptotic formulae*, Proceedings of the session in analytic number theory and Diophantine equations (Bonn, January–June, 2002), Bonn 2003, Edited by D. R. Heath-Brown and B. Z. Moroz, Bonner Mathematische Schriften, Nr. 360, Article 30, 32pp.

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, BUNSENSTRASSE 3–5, D-37073 GÖTTINGEN, GERMANY
E-mail address: bruedern@uni-math.gwdg.de

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL, UNIVERSITY WALK, CLIFTON,
 BRISTOL BS8 1TW, UNITED KINGDOM
E-mail address: matdw@bristol.ac.uk